REPORT / RECOMMENDATION



To:

Park Board

Agenda Item #: VI.A.

From:

Ann Kattreh

Action 🗵 Discussion

Parks & Recreation Director

Information

Date:

August 11, 2014

Subject: Park Master Plan Consultant Interviews

Action Requested:

Select a park master plan consultant

Information / Background:

The Park Board will be receiving presentations from the four park master plan consultants who submitted proposals. The interview schedule is as follows:

Time	Group	Team Leader		
7 p.m.	Confluence	Terry Minarik		
7:30 p.m.	Cuningham	Bruce Jacobson		
8 p.m.	SEH	Bob Kost		
8:30 p.m.	SRF	Ken Grieshaber		

The consultants have been asked to give a 15-20 minute presentation, allowing 10 minutes for questions from the Park Board. You received the consultant proposals in early July. It would be helpful to review those proposals again prior to this meeting.

Attached please find a scoring sheet that may be used during the interview process. The scoring sheet reflects the highlights of the request for proposal that the consultants responded to. We will not be collecting these forms. It is just intended to provide a format for information and note taking.

If the Park Board reaches a consensus on a consultant at the August 11 Park Board meeting, staff will work out the details of the contractual agreement with the consultant and place the contract on the September 2 City Council agenda for approval.

Attachment: Scoring Sheet

NAME	OF	FIRM:	Confluence

The proposals will be evaluated in four areas:

- 1. Project understanding/objectives
- 2. Qualifications/experience of personnel working on the project
- 3. Work plan/schedule
- 4. Cost

Ranking of each firm on your impression of and the strength of their plan

Criteria	Weak Average Strong

A statement of objectives & goals

A description of deliverables

An outline of the firm's background & experience

A detailed work plan that identifies major tasks to be completed

A detailed cost breakdown for tasks to be performed

Proposed public engagement plan

Overall thoughts & ranking:

NAME OF FIRM: Cuningham

The proposals will be evaluated in four areas:

1. Project understanding/objectives

2. Qualifications/experience of personnel working on the project	ct		
3. Work plan/schedule			
4. Cost			
Ranking of each firm on your impression of and the strength of their	plan		
Criteria	eak .	Average	Strong
A statement of objectives & goals A description of deliverables			
An outline of the firm's background & experience			
A detailed work plan that identifies major tasks to be completed			
A detailed cost breakdown for tasks to be performed			
Proposed public engagement plan			
Overall thoughts & ranking:			

NAME OF FIRM: SEH

The proposals will be evaluated in four areas:

1. Project understanding/objectives

2. Qualifications/experience of personnel working on the pro-	ject		
3. Work plan/schedule			
4. Cost			
Ranking of each firm on your impression of and the strength of th	eir plan		
Criteria	Weak	Average	Strong
A statement of objectives & goals			
A description of deliverables			
An outline of the firm's background & experience			
A detailed work plan that identifies major tasks to be completed			
A detailed cost breakdown for tasks to be performed			
Proposed public engagement plan			
Overall thoughts & ranking:	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		

NAME OF FIRM: SRF

The proposals will be evaluated in four areas:

1. Project understanding/objectives

2. Qualifications/experience of personnel working on the p	roject		
3. Work plan/schedule			
4. Cost			
Ranking of each firm on your impression of and the strength of t	their plan		
Criteria	Weak	Average	Strong
A statement of objectives & goals			44 3 3 3 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
A description of deliverables			
An outline of the firm's background & experience			
A detailed work plan that identifies major tasks to be completed	I		
A detailed cost breakdown for tasks to be performed			
Proposed public engagement plan			
Overall thoughts & ranking:		<u> </u>	